DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 549 SP 030 702

AUTHOR Marsh, John, Ed.
TITLE The Bar Harbor Colloquium on Teacher Education (Bar Harbor, Maine, May 13, 1985). A Sumary Report to the Frost Foundation.
INSTITUTION Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-89492-059-6
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 59p.
AVAILABLE FROM Academy for Educational Development, 1255 23rd St. NW, Washington, DC 20037 (charge for shipping only).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Learning Strategies; *Masters Degrees; Schools of Education; *Student Recruitment; *Teacher Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

The papers collected in the colloquium report were revised to take into account both the original arguments of the presenters and the points raised in the follow-up discussions. Title and authors are: (1) "Some Myths of Teacher Education " (Gene I. Maeroff); (2) "Reflection and Passion in Teacher Education" (Maxine Greene); and (3) "The Master of Arts in Teaching: An Idea Whose Time Has Come" (Theodore Kauss). Opening and closing remarks by colloquium moderator Francis Keppel are included. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED301549

THE BAR HARBOR COLLOQUIUM ON TEACHER EDUCATION

A Summary Report to the Frost Foundation

SP030702

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Webster

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Bar Harbor Colloquium on Teacher Education

The Bar Harbor Colloquium on Teacher Education

A Summary Report to the Frost Foundation

Academy for Educational Development
New York
1986

Copyright 1986 by the Academy for Educational Development

"Some Myths of Teacher Education" ©1986 by Gene I. Maeroff
"Reflection and Passion in Teacher Education" ©1986 by Maxine Greene
"The Master of Arts in Teaching: An Idea Whose Time Has Come, Again" ©1986 by Theodore Kauss

Photo credits: pp. 12, 16, 28—Richard A. Chase; p. 42—Ryden & Associates
Drawing on inside back cover by Douglas Alvord
ISBN 0-89492-059-6

Edited by John March

Production: Post Scripts, East Boothbay, Maine
Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Foreword 7

Introduction 9

Sponsors 11

Opening Remarks *by Francis Keppel* 13

Some Myths of Teacher Education *by Gene I. Maeroff* 17

Reflection and Passion in Teacher Education *by Maxine Greene* 29

The Master of Arts in Teaching: An Idea Whose Time Has Come, Again *by Theodore Kauss* 43

Closing Remarks *by Francis Keppel* 55

Foreword

In its role as an adviser to educational institutions, the Academy for Educational Development does more than carry out projects on behalf of numerous clients. We also seek to anticipate topics of forthcoming concern, so that we can respond effectively as new needs and challenges arise. Our current involvement in teacher education reflects this forward-thinking policy. (It also takes us back to our institutional roots: the Academy's first project, in Kansas, included an assessment of teacher education programs in that state.)

As Louis Rabineau notes in his introduction, the Academy recognized quite early that teacher education at the elementary and secondary levels would become an issue of major national concern. Edwin F. Whited and Theodore Kauss, President and Executive Director, respectively, of the Frost Foundation, concurred with our findings and generously agreed to support a broad series of initiatives in this area. The Bar Harbor Colloquium on Teacher Education is the first of several undertakings that will begin, we hope, to set the agenda for discussions of teacher education in this country. I commend the following papers to your attention.

Alvin C. Eurich
President
Academy for Educational Development

Introduction

In 1984 it became evident that teacher education would become a matter of major national concern. The Academy for Educational Development therefore sought and obtained support from the Frost Foundation to stimulate discussion of teacher education and to inform key leaders on related matters. Possibly one of the most impressive programs stemming from this effort was the daylong colloquium detailed in the following pages.

The Bar Harbor Colloquium on Teacher Education was held at College of the Atlantic on May 13, 1985. The papers compiled here were presented on that occasion, and I am confident that they will be of real interest to those schools, colleges, and government agencies that are now dealing with the challenge of teacher education.

Naturally, no single conference can address all aspects of teacher education. What follows is a series of thoughtful papers and comments designed to strike sparks of interest among readers concerned with the education of teachers – and to sharpen the desire of readers to learn more.

The topics discussed at the colloquium were as varied as the speakers themselves. They included 1) current myths surrounding teacher education, 2) the need to look beyond mere technique in the art of teaching, and 3) a possible solution to the problem of inadequately trained teachers: a revival of the Master of Arts in Teaching degree program.

The presenters and commentators at the Bar Harbor Colloquium were among the most knowledgeable and authoritative individuals in their fields. Francis Keppel, Senior Lecturer on Education at Harvard University and former U. S. Commissioner of Education, served as moderator of the colloquium. The presenters were Gene Maeroff, education writer for the *New York Times*, Dr. Maxine Greene, of Teachers College of Columbia University, and Dr. Theodore Kauss, Executive Director of the Frost Foundation and former director of the Master of Arts in Teaching program at Northwestern University.

A panel of commentators was also present to review and reflect on each of the papers as they were delivered. This latter group con-

sisted of Dr. Edward J. Meade, Jr., program officer in charge of public education at the Ford Foundation, Dr. Gordon Klopf, Dean and Director of the Bank Street College of Education, and Dr. Sharon Franz, Director of School Services at the Academy for Educational Development.

At the colloquium each presenter read an initial draft of his or her remarks. These drafts were later revised by the authors for publication, taking into account the points raised in the followup discussions in Bar Harbor. Thus, the papers represent both the original arguments of the presenters and the contributions of the commentators and members of the audience.

A final note: This colloquium could easily have been presented in Boston, New York, or any other major city. Why, instead, did we choose to hold it at College of the Atlantic, on Maine's Mount Desert Island? The answer is simple. The Bar Harbor location was chosen for its striking beauty, which we hoped would stimulate a freewheeling and open discussion. The following pages demonstrate that the choice was a good one.

The Academy is pleased to present these papers, and we are especially grateful to their authors for the opportunity to do so. We are confident that this material will be of value to any audience concerned, as we are, with the future of teacher education.

Louis Rabineau
Senior Vice President
Academy for Educational Development
President
College of the Atlantic

Sponsors

Academy for Educational Development

The Academy for Educational Development is a private, non-profit educational services and consulting organization operating primarily on the basis of grants and contracts with colleges, universities, schools and school systems, foundations, businesses, and governmental and international agencies. Chartered in 1961, the Academy is marking its 25th anniversary in 1986.

From its beginning in college management, the Academy has branched out into other areas: executive search; school and family services; the arts; business training and education; and international activities. To date, the Academy has operated programs in about 100 developing countries. These efforts range from literacy, health, and nutrition programs to vocational and technical training, communication and telecommunication development assistance, and agriculture and family planning activities. The Academy is committed to operating wherever it can serve human needs.

The Frost Foundation

The Frost Foundation was created on March 19, 1959, to be operated for educational, charitable, and religious purposes. It was named in honor of Edwin Ambrose Frost and Virginia Chappelle Frost.

The Foundation is especially interested in creative and innovative projects which focus on meeting critical societal needs and which possess the potential to be replicated successfully in communities where similar problems exist.

College of the Atlantic

Please see inside back cover

Acknowledgments

Additional support for the Bar Harbor Colloquium on Teacher Education was provided through an Outreach Grant from the Maine Humanities Council. The Council supports projects that bring the insights of the humanities into the lives of Maine people.

The organization of the colloquium was coordinated by College of the Atlantic faculty member Peter Corcoran and COA student Erin Saunders, who jointly attended to the thousand and one details that, taken together, made the colloquium a success.

CUTTING BACK
QUALITATIVE

Opening Remarks

By Francis Keppel

By way of introduction I would like to put teacher education in a context that you may want to keep in mind as you listen to the following speakers.

It is fair to say that the usual definition of education is borrowed from the Latin *educare*, "to lead out." But for American teacher education, there is a second definition not found in most dictionaries, which is: "an enterprise in need of constant reform." This definition has been roundly confirmed over the decades.

Granted that this *is* an enterprise in need of constant reform, I would like to lay before you a few facts of interest to potential reformers. In this country we have about 20,000 high schools and about 80,000 elementary schools scattered across the fifty states. That's pretty frightening when you think about it, especially if you happen to be working in a state capitol or in Washington. Why? Because the thought of a centrally managed enterprise with that much diffusion, that much socio-economic difference, and that much ethnic and language difference is appalling. The thought of a centrally managed teacher-education enterprise in this country – something along the lines of the Ministry of Education in France – is frightening. Indeed,

---

FRANCIS KEPPEL *is a Senior Lecturer on Education at the Harvard University Graduate School of Education and Chairman of the Board of Appropriate Technology International, of Washington, D. C. In 1948, at age 32, he was named Dean of Harvard's Graduate School of Education. During the period from 1948 to 1962, Mr. Keppel also served on national and international groups, including an education commission for the Nigerian government. From 1962 to 1966 he served as U. S. Commissioner of Education, and later as Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (for Education). During his term of office, the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, the Higher Education Acts of 1963 and 1965, and other federal laws were enacted.*

it's impossible. We are a continent as well as a nation in the European sense. Therefore, if you're talking about planning or thinking about personnel for such an enterprise, it is very difficult to think meaningfully in national terms, as if it could be or should be managed nationally. In point of fact, of course, it hasn't. Teacher education has responded to a wide variety of intellectual, social, and economic forces throughout the history of this country. And it is precisely this sense of size and diversity that I would like to get across.

Let me see if I can put it another way. If you were in Bangor or Boston and you wanted to get a sense of who, among the people walking along the street, were school teachers, you would single out about one in forty adults. We're dealing with about 2.5 million public school teachers, and another 300,000 or so in the private schools. That's an army of people. In other words, we're talking about a very large, very scattered, and very unmanageable enterprise.

My second point is related. This nation has relied on sexism for the quality and devotion of its teaching resources. The quality of our public schools until recent times has depended on the fact that women did not have access to careers other than teaching and nursing.

This is beginning to change—and, as the father of daughters, I think that's a good thing.

However, the problem of teacher recruitment now is not just that *numerically* women are entering other careers in greater numbers. It is also a *qualitative* problem: teaching and nursing had the pick of intelligent and energetic women. But now it's a new ballgame. And I ask you to see that against my earlier statement that you cannot have, or shouldn't try to have, a national policy of teacher recruitment. Obviously, it makes the task more complicated.

Most of us in my generation tend to think, though perhaps we shouldn't, in historical analogies. In this sense, let me ask "Where are we now in teacher education?"

I suspect that we are not far from the early 1950s, as a point of comparison. We're now having a second wave of students. In other words, we are experiencing a baby boomlet, and the number of children entering elementary school is beginning to go up. The figures vary from one region of the country to another, of course, but the trend is there. High school enrollment, however, is still going down. The problem we're looking at, therefore, is a varied problem, varying by age group and by region of the country.

Therefore, if we are to make any progress (in this peculiarly American, crablike fashion that we have of making progress, where everybody does his own thing and we hope we all get somewhere together) *we all have to operate on the same set of facts.* And one of the things I understand the Frost Foundation is trying to do is

get the facts right. I mean numbers of pupils, their distribution nationally—the whole demographic analysis. Let me say it again: *to get the numbers right is really important*. And I don't think we have the numbers right. We need good figures on student populations, sources of supply, and—perhaps most important of all—the rates of turnover. Right now, nobody can do anything more than guess what the rate of turnover is. By this I mean the rate of departure within different parts of the country. I'm *sure* a national average on turnover is meaningless.

To repeat—and to conclude—I would urge those of you who are interested in teacher education to give some thought to getting the numbers right.

14

Some Myths of Teacher Education

By Gene I. Maeroff

Quite suddenly, after years during which a place could be found for almost any warm body as a student in some School of Education somewhere, the emphasis is on raising standards for individuals entering teacher training programs and for those entering the teaching profession in general. One cannot easily block the notion of higher standards—but where will the candidates come from who are capable of leaping over the bar once it has been raised a few notches?

The fact is that the percentage of high school seniors indicating an interest in entering teaching has been shrinking precipitously. As recently as the middle 1970s, one out of every five high school seniors said this was his or her intention. Today one in 20 is expecting to go into teaching. The conventional wisdom is that outside events have exerted so powerful a disincentive that nothing could have been done to keep the attitudes of young people from changing in this way. This is only partly true.

No one questions the role that high school teachers themselves have played in this transformation of attitudes toward teaching as a career. It is not as though young people have no contact with teachers. Of all occupational groups, teachers, more than any other, have the chance to proselytize in favor of their profession. In fact, they have a captive audience. Clearly they have not taken proper advantage of the situation.

In part, the attitude shift away from teaching as a career reflects on the teachers in whose presence young people spend a good por-

---

GENE I. MAEROFF *is an education writer for the* New York Times. *His books include* School and College: Partnership in Education, Don't Blame the Kids: The Trouble with America's Public Schools, *and* The Guide to Suburban Public Schools. *He is a member of the Advisory Board of the Institute for Educational Management at Harvard University's Graduate School of Education and an Associate in the University Seminar on Higher Education at Columbia University.*

tion of their lives. What have teachers been doing and saying in the presence of young people since the mid-1970s? What have they been telling their high school students? What sorts of examples have they been setting?

The first myth of teacher education is that nothing could have been done to dissuade high school students from choosing careers other than elementary and secondary school teaching. It is true that mores have shifted and, fortunately, opportunities have expanded for young women. But the first step toward changing the present situation certainly can be taken by the high school teachers who have day-to-day contact with young people at that very crucial point when these students are making some genuine decisions about their careers.

Thirty years ago there was an organization in high schools called Future Teachers of America. It seems to have withered away. Why not revitalize this effort and start doing more to give high school students the opportunity to serve as aides to teachers and to tutor in elementary schools? Certainly such exposure to the profession would allow more young people to begin thinking seriously about what a career in teaching has to offer. Schools of education could also get involved in such programs along with high schools.

An example of what is possible can be seen in New York City, where vocational education teachers last year identified some of their most outstanding graduating seniors and recruited them into a teacher preparation program. Thirty young men and women who got their high school diplomas in June, 1984, returned to the schools in September as assistant teachers. For five years they will rotate every six months between jobs in industry and positions as assistant teachers. Two evenings a week they will pursue tuition-free college courses. During the entire time, they will be paid 90 percent of a regular teacher's salary and they will receive all benefits. In many cases, their mentors in the schools are the very teachers who selected them for the program.

Another illustration of the possibilities can be seen in Houston, where there is a High School for Teaching Professions. Students get exposed to such tasks as lesson planning and have a chance to work as teachers' aides. This is no panacea for the teaching shortage, but it does show that school officials can do more than sit back and complain that young people don't want to be teachers. And certainly there is adequate evidence that more teachers are going to have to be found if the schools are to be fully staffed. The National Center for Education Statistics projects that 1.6 million additional teachers will be needed in elementary and secondary schools between 1985 and 1993. A shortage of immense proportions is in the making.

Thus, if the best and the brightest students are turning their backs on education, educators must give themselves at least some of the blame. What have they been saying to young people about teaching as a career? The sad fact is that all too many teachers have actually been persuading young people not to go into teaching.

Next on the list of myths about teacher education is the notion that everything that is wrong with teaching can be solved by doing more to test the candidates. Tests are being adopted for getting into teacher education programs, for graduating from those programs, and for gaining certification. There is a belief that once people capable of passing these examinations can be lured into teaching the manpower problem will be solved.

Not quite. A new problem is in the making and it is of enormous magnitude. Minority candidates simply cannot pass the tests in the same proportion as whites. Society can ill afford to ignore the implications of this situation. The myth here is that we can solve the problem of teacher quality by testing teachers. In fact, the seeming solution to one problem may well leave us with a new problem.

Not only does equity demand that this issue be addressed, but so does practicality. At this point, almost 30 percent of all pupils in the nation's public schools are minority group members—and the ranks are swelling. Unless something happens to change the trend that the tests are abetting, the country faces an eerie future in which school systems increasingly made up of minority children will be staffed by people who increasingly are white.

Findings by the Educational Testing Service, which studied the problem in several states, attest to the difficulty. In California, for instance, passing rates on the test for teacher candidates were 76 percent for whites, 39 percent for Hispanics, and 26 percent for blacks. In Georgia, the rates were 87 percent for whites and 34 percent for blacks.

Deans of the schools of education at universities in Louisiana are, in fact, asked that the state lower its requirements for new teachers. Louisiana is a state in which black students have had a particularly difficult time passing the state test. The deans say that the threat of a teacher shortage is so ominous that the state can ill afford to turn away people who want to teach.

In Mississippi, blacks failed the test to be teachers at a rate 11 times that of whites. The state is more than 50 percent black, but there are troublesome signs that the black presence on school faculties is diminishing.

Patricia M. Lines, director of the Law and Education Center of the Education Commission of the States in Denver, pointed out some

of the legal implications of this teacher-testing movement in the May issue of the *Phi Delta Kappan*. Lines reminds us that the courts have reached several verdicts in related cases that have implications for teacher tests. In particular, she pointed out the following: distinctions between individual teachers are valid as long as the distinctions are rational and have a legitimate purpose; intentional race- and sex-based discrimination among individual teachers, however, is unconstitutional. And a test that has a disproportionate impact on women or minorities is valid only if it is properly used to distinguish between the qualified and the unqualified, and invalid if it is used for a hidden discriminatory purpose.

This whole issue is a tough one. And the answer cannot be a flight from the higher standards everyone knows are necessary. Yet, how can higher standards be implemented—and not compromised—without devastating the ranks of minority teachers?

Let us also bear in mind that even if all questions of equity could be satisfactorily reconciled and tests required for all new teachers throughout the country, the effect on the schools would still be minimal. The vast majority of teachers who will be teaching in the schools five, ten, and even fifteen years from now are already in the schools. Only a small number of new teachers are being added and the ones who are already in place are not the ones who would be tested. Only Arkansas, Texas, and Georgia are making any move toward testing people already at work in the schools. So it would take a generation before the schools are almost fully staffed with teachers who have come in through a testing process.

Physician, Heal Thyself

Surely one of the more irksome myths of teacher education is that teacher educators are capable of reforming themselves. For years, there has been a national association for accrediting teacher education programs and a national organization of colleges of education. And for just as many years teacher education has been a subject of ridicule—not entirely warranted, to be sure, but certainly not without basis.

The saying goes, "Physician, heal thyself." Some people seem to think that we can also say, "Teacher Educator, heal thyself." It does not work. Teacher education is afflicted by a serious malady and the system does not seem capable of restoring itself to good health.

Why, for example, are so many teacher education programs allowed to continue? There cannot be quality up and down the line when so many colleges in the country offer teacher education. Teacher education has to be more than a jobs program to give employment to faculty members in schools of education.

"Today more than 70 percent of all of the institutions of higher education in this country provide programs which lead to teacher certification," says Robert H. Koff, dean of the School of Education at the State University of New York at Albany. He continues: "About 90 are not even regionally accredited. The institutions are large and small, secular and religious, graduate and undergraduate. About 41,000 persons teach teachers in nearly 1,300 institutions of higher education. Some have education faculties that number more than 150 while others have only one, two, or three (can you imagine a medical school faculty of only two or three faculty members?). In a large majority of these institutions the faculty do no research. In fact, about 80 percent of the educational research published in this country is accounted for by faculty employed in only about 30 of the leading doctoral degree granting universities."

The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education decided in 1985 to redesign its standards and procedures for accreditation. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, also this year, decided to strengthen national standards for certification. How nice. Why did it take so long? What were these organizations doing while the crisis was in the making?

There is, in addition, the myth that future elementary school teachers must major in education as undergraduates. Why? Future lawyers major in political science or French or botany. Future physicians major in philosophy or sociology or chemistry. Fortunately, an influential group of deans of more than two dozen leading teacher education programs, calling themselves the Holmes Group, this year took the bold step of calling for the end of education as a major, even for those preparing to teach in elementary schools.

A position paper of the Holmes Group stated: "Undergirding the plans described here is the belief that career professionals can be prepared effectively by a combining of the undergraduate study, master's degree, and continuing education taken in the early years of teaching. The basic plan calls for a full year of post-baccalaureate study, followed by an induction year in the schools which combines paid internship with continued education."

Many teachers in private and parochial schools—at both the elementary and secondary levels—have never taken an education course, let alone majored in education. Isn't it curious that parents will pay fantastic sums for the privilege of having their children taught by these teachers who never sat in an education course?

This is not to say that there is not a place for courses on learning theory and pedagogical methods. Dewey, Piaget, and Bloom are thinkers whose works should be known to people who intend to teach. In addition, there is certainly something to be gained by studying

how to teach a subject like reading, rather than trying to do it without some preparation for the task. Just recently a new report, "Becoming a Nation of Readers," urged that teachers get more training in reading instruction. The report, supported by a federal grant to the University of Illinois, spoke of the need for better textbooks, greater parental involvement, and careful use of standardized tests; but, ultimately, it turned its attention to the need for more able teachers.

The obverse side of the above-mentioned myth is the argument that no education course whatsoever is worth offering. This, too, is rubbish and is as wrong as saying that everyone going into elementary schools ought to major in education.

C. Peter Magrath, the president of the University of Missouri, headed a recent commission that examined ways of improving teacher education. This is what he had to say about the pedagogical portion of a schoolteacher's education: "It is too easy to ridicule 'how to teach' courses, though those that are easy should be ridiculed. But teaching combines both art and science, and while it must first and foremost proceed from a strong and rigorous base of academic content, a teacher must also know how to communicate that content. Our nation's new generation of teachers must have knowledge as to how one helps students overcome difficulties and errors. No less important, our nation's teachers must benefit from a solid base in organized research."

For the most part, though, the place for courses in pedagogy and methods should not necessarily be in the undergraduate curriculum and certainly not as part of a major field of study. There is good reason to consider making education only a minor at the undergraduate level.

If lawyers and physicians can get their professional training after the baccalaureate, then certainly it must be possible for teachers as well. One of the unfortunate facts is that the public does not realize that secondary school teachers do not major in education. Now it may be time to let future elementary school teachers, as well, major in a subject area.

In other words, leave future elementary school teachers free to become expert at something. New York City's public schools recently tested fifth and eighth graders to assess the state of their scientific knowledge. The results were abysmal. But instead of pointing fingers at the kids, school officials looked toward the teachers and decided that the only way to change the situation is to make elementary school teachers better prepared to teach science.

Think of the impact it would have if every person entering the schools as an elementary teacher were well grounded in at least one subject. Then there could be more of a move toward the sort of

departmentalization that ought to take place at that level if children are really going to get a proper foundation for secondary schools.

Alternative Routes to Teaching

Other ventures beckon as well. There is more and more interest in requiring an internship for new teachers. Would it not be possible to infuse this period with much of the professional education? Moreover, a master's degree is becoming rather standard for teachers. With this in mind, it might be possible to concentrate much of the professional education of teachers at the graduate level.

College professors teach students who are just a few years older than those taught by high school teachers, yet few members of college faculties have formally studied education. For some reason, it is acceptable to put such people at the front of a class and to assume that students will learn. I am not saying that all of those who teach at the college level are successful at the task, but certainly their careers do suggest that some assumptions about teachers at the lower levels, particularly in secondary schools, are not altogether correct.

More thought must be given to alternative routes into teaching. Schools would benefit from unclogging the pathways and making it easier, for example, for persons seeking mid-career changes to consider teaching. But they are not likely to do it if they must go get education courses first. New Jersey, California, and Texas are exploring some promising avenues of this sort.

In New Jersey, for instance, the 1985-86 school year will start with dozens of new teachers admitted to the classroom by the alternative route, never having been required to take an education course. But these teachers will be closely monitored and evaluated, and they will be required to take in-service training. The extent of their preparation will far exceed the tens of thousands who go to work each year in school districts across the country on emergency licenses.

The delivery system for professional courses has been part of the problem in imparting pedagogy. At long last, with innovations such as the alternative route, there is more and more movement toward change. Even for regular education students there is a greater tendency to offer courses as practica right in the school building where undergraduates are doing their student teaching. Surely there are possibilities of doing this for older, mid-career people who want to become teachers. Maybe there is reason to stop teaching about education in a vacuum; perhaps more of the training should take place at the job site in conjunction with real children.

Teacher's salaries are not within the province of schools of education and some may argue that mentioning this subject in a discus-

sion of the myths of teacher education is inappropriate. I think not. The salary issue is mentioned more than any other factor when people talk about what can be done to improve teachers.

There is little that schools of education can do to assure that salaries of teachers will increase, but they can surely be more aware of the extent to which the low-salary explanation is a myth for the reason why there are not better teachers. Salary is an important consideration and I do not want to imply that it is not. It is absolutely sinful that there are teachers in some states who have been in the business for 10 years or 15 years and still do not make $15,000 annually.

But salaries—those at both the starting and the advanced levels—may not have as much to do with keeping people out of teaching as is argued by those who are fighting to raise salaries, which, please understand, I agree should be done.

I can cite for you a field in which the average starting salary is $12,000, an amount comparable to the average beginning salary in teaching. And the average salary for veteran members of the occupation I have in mind is approximately that of teachers, who average $23,500. But this particular field, unlike teaching, has so many applicants—many of them from the best colleges in the country—it has to turn many of them away.

I am talking about journalism—a field that is immensely popular with the young, despite the low salaries at the starting and veteran levels. The substantial salaries paid by the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Los Angeles Times* and the *Wall Street Journal* are the exceptions. Most journalists are paid abysmally low salaries, salaries so low that many of these journalists could switch to teaching and still take home about the same size paycheck.

Here is a very specific example. Reporters in Bellevue, Washington, recently negotiated their first union contract. As a result, salaries are going to be as much as 29 percent higher than they were. This contract calls for a weekly salary of $445. Do you know what that amounts to over the course of a year: exactly $23,140.

But let me strike a little closer to home. Why limit this argument to journalists? Much the same argument could be made in connection with college teachers. People want these jobs so badly that they are willing to accept adjunct positions that are akin to servitude.

The point is that most college teachers do not get paid much more than most elementary and secondary school teachers.

A recent survey by the American Association of University Professors produced information on average faculty salaries around the country. The findings are illuminating because these salaries are not very different from those paid to schoolteachers. The average full

professor—those in the highest-paid category—receives $39,600 at Central Connecticut State University, $25,700 at the University of Jacksonville, $28,800 at the University of Maine at Augusta, and $32,900 at Hartwick College in New York State. The average pay for instructors—those at the lowest rung—is $17,300 in the University of Kentucky Community College System, $19,800 at St. Peter's College in New Jersey, $15,100 at Eastern Oregon State College, and $17,500 at the University of Southern Maine.

Clearly, there are factors that make people willing and even eager to overlook low salaries to become journalists and college teachers. And yet salaries that are virtually no better than those paid to journalists and college teachers are put forward as the explanation for people not wanting to go into elementary and secondary school teaching. There is much more than low salaries keeping people out of teaching, and even raising those salaries by a few thousand dollars would not make a big difference in dealing with these obstacles—though that is not a reason for not increasing salaries.

I suggest it is time to start looking at more than salary as the explanation for why people are not entering teaching. Such factors as lack of respect, low status, lack of job satisfaction, and poor working conditions must be more closely considered as explanations. Linda Darling Hammond of the Rand Corporation wrote that "the primary rewards of teaching are the intrinsic, non-pecuniary satisfactions derived from imparting knowledge and seeing young people grow and learn." The disintegration of the circumstances of teaching is not being given sufficient credit for the importance it has played in keeping people out of secondary and elementary school teaching.

Further Hurdles

There is also the myth that all teachers must be paid the same, whatever they teach. The National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers have done a marvelous job of perpetuating the idea that teachers of the same experience who have the same number of academic credits ought to be paid the same amount of money. In other words, a driver education teacher should be paid the same as the physics teacher, even if this means it will be much harder to hire physics teachers.

This approach flies in the face of what any good social studies teacher is telling students about the free market economy and the laws of supply and demand. The failure to acknowledge the difference in the income potential of an English major and a computer science major spells disaster for the schools. There will not be enough com-

petent teachers of computer science available if this exercise in unreality continues. There will not be enough science teachers and there will not be enough math teachers and there will not be enough teachers of certain vocational subjects.

Let's be realistic: some people possess skills that at certain places and at certain times are more valuable to society than other kinds of skills. The schools cannot, in the best interests of their students, continue to ignore this fact. The problem can be seen throughout the country in statistics showing that in an entire state in a given year – and you can pick your state – there are no more than three or four students graduating from college as physics majors with a minor in secondary education.

This gets us to the last myth that I would like to note: the myth that once salaries are higher and schools of education are reformed and first-rate people flock into teaching, everything is going to be dandy in the schools. I'm sorry, but this is not so. As long as learning is impeded by the kinds of obstacles that are not in the schools, education is not likely to change dramatically simply because teachers are getting more money and better educational preparation.

At the same time, more must be done to find creative solutions to the monstrous problems that affect teaching and learning. The most obvious of these, of course, has to do with the expectation by society that the schools will be able to fill the gap that exists in children's lives because of the failure of so many other institutions.

To be very specific, I would suggest that without dramatic changes in class sizes there is very little improvement in prospect for the inner-city schools where the situation is most desperate. And I am not talking about slicing the size of classes by two or three children. What must happen if the cycle of failure is to be broken in inner-city schools is that classes must be reduced to no more than 10 or 15 children. Individual attention is essential for these youngsters. The best teachers in the world are not going to solve the problem as long as they must deal with the needs of 25 or 30 children. And chipping away one or two students from the size of a class is not going to make a difference.

Let me close on a more favorable note. Teachers, after all, ought to be considered just about the most important people in our society, and if teacher education is not all it might be this does not mean that teachers themselves are the ones who bear all the blame. As efforts go forth to improve teacher preparation, there must be a companion attempt to educate society itself about the need to straighten out its values. The fabulous amount of money bestowed on athletes and entertainers dwarfs all statements that might be made about what is really important in America.

As a reminder about what counts, though, let me share with you the thoughts of Carlos Caraballo, an 18-year-old who has returned as an assistant teacher to the New York City vocational high school in which he was a senior the previous year. This is what Mr. Caraballo, a budding expert in auto mechanics, observed:

"I like the idea of teaching other people what I know. Teachers are important people and they don't get the recognition they deserve. Without teachers we wouldn't have doctors, lawyers, or anything. Teachers make it all possible."

Reflection and Passion in Teacher Education

By Maxine Greene

The commission reports on American education have been raining down for almost two years now; and, quite naturally, teacher education has become problematic once again. I think of Abraham Flexner writing in 1930 about our field, saying (with respect to the great schools of education of that time) that "philosophy, scholarship and history have tended to fade much too far into the background; technique, administration, 'socialization' have come more and more to the fore. . . ." I think of Arthur Bestor, twenty-five years later, blaming the faculties of arts and sciences in the universities for abdicating their responsibilities for teacher education and leaving "a vacuum into which the professional educationists have moved." I think of James B. Conant, James Koerner, and Robert M. Hutchins, all to a large degree concerned with the "miseducation" of American teachers. I think of the peculiar anomaly of "performance-based teacher education," of the "competencies" movement, of the stern demands for "accountability." And then I think of current responses to the charge that our nation is "at risk" and of the ways in which the field is being demarcated once again. We hear of mastery now and common learnings, effectiveness, classroom management, teacher testing, job analysis, career ladders, and (yes) quality teaching—all in the name of school improvement, reform, and (of course) excellence. I have no wish to challenge the work being done, the research

---

MAXINE GREENE *is William F. Russell Professor in the Foundations of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. She has also served on the faculties of City University of New York, New York University, and Montclair State College. A prolific author, Dr. Greene has written many books, articles, and scholarly papers. Her books include* The Public School and the Private Vision, Existential Encounters for Teachers, Teacher as Stranger: Educational Philosophy in the Modern Age, *and* Landscapes of Learning. *Dr. Greene has held leadership posts in a number of professional organizations, and in 1984 she was elected to the National Academy of Education.*

being undertaken, the networks being formed. But I want to call attention to a dimension of our professional concern that may be overlooked in the onward rush of things, a dimension we may be too likely to forget.

David Schon's book *The Reflective Practitioner* reminded me of it, as have some other things (not necessarily related to education) that I have recently read or reread. Schon writes about "the crisis of confidence in professional knowledge," including ours. He attributes this in part to a reliance on models of professional knowledge that cannot account for the processes essential to competent practice: "making sense of uncertainty, performing artistically, setting problems, and choosing among competing paradigms. . . ." What we do, he says, is use a model of technical rationality that makes us think of intelligent practice as a series of instrumental decisions which we try to make more and more rigorous by the application of scientific theory and technique—in our case, in the guise of various psychologies, certain of the social sciences, or the instructional and computer sciences.

Because Schon made me ponder the relation between scientific theory and technique and the diverse, unstable, particular situations in which teachers do their work, I thought of the philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty, who also wondered about that connection. "Scientific thinking," he wrote, "a thinking which looks on from above, and thinks of the object-in-general, must return to the 'there is' which underlies it: to the site, the soil of the sensible and opened world such as it is in our life and for our body—not that possible body which we may legitimately think of as an information machine, but that actual body I call mine, this sentinel standing quietly at the command of my words and my acts." That is from "Eye and Mind," an essay about lived life, painting, and the visible world. Yes, and about action and passion intertwined, and about perspective, and about possibility. And I wondered about the degree to which our favored mode of rationality makes us focus on the classroom-in-general, or children-in-general, or teaching-in-general—and whether we are distancing teachers from their actual bodies and asking them to treat themselves as information machines.

I am concerned, certainly, about competent practice and about what Schon calls "reflection-in-action" as an alternative to technical rationality. But I need first to say that I am concerned about something in addition to competent practice, important as it is for all of us to define and understand. I am concerned, and I think we ought to talk more readily about, what that practice is *for*, about the purposes we define for ourselves at this peculiar moment of our history.

I realize that the word "excellence" is intended to encompass

them—excellence defined in terms of higher standards, measurable achievements that must be increased because our nation is at risk. And how are we at risk? Because our defense capability is not what it should be (MX missiles despite), and we cannot be sure of our technological primacy in the world. Yes, there is also talk of disenfranchisement in some of the reports, poor preparation for work, and the absence of a "common culture" (or the decline of what is now being called "cultural literacy"). The tone is cool and assured; the implications are meant to seem inescapable. If we have the proper knowledge base, if we become more rigorous, if we pay more heed to content and less to method, if we underwrite merit and mastery, if we become more technically expert, we will solve what are largely technical problems, and we will no longer be at risk.

I must append to this another side of what is being asked of us; it derives from President Reagan's celebration in his State of the Union message this year of the so-called economic miracle we are enjoying. We are, he told us, "poised for greatness." To use the *New York Times* paraphrase: "He limned the dazzling dream of a new high-tech revolution powered by super-computers, lasers, and the pure efficiency of industry operating in the zero gravity of manned space stations." He promised a "second American revolution of hope and opportunity; a revolution carrying us to new heights of progress by pushing back frontiers of knowledge and space." He touted initiatives such as enterprise zones, health-care vouchers, and constitutional amendments against abortion and for voluntary school prayer.

We can only assume that, according to the official point of view, we will be at risk if we do not serve that futurist dream—at least by preparing those with the potential for pushing back frontiers and, most probably, by turning aside from those Harold Howe calls the "at-risk" among us—the excluded ones, those who are poor, nonwhite, handicapped, female, those largely ignored by the proposals to reform our schools.

I believe we will be at risk if we continue to break the promises we have made. (Hannah Arendt said that our ability to make and keep promises sets up "in the ocean of uncertainty, which is the future by definition, islands of security without which continuity" would be impossible in the relationships among human beings. "Without being bound to the fulfillment of promises," she went on, "we would never be able to keep our identities; we would be condemned to wander helplessly and without direction. . . .") We break our promises if we pay no heed to the "increasing sense of anger and frustration at the wastefulness" of schools, as Howe's advocacy group says, that disregard too many of the young; and I do indeed believe that something is happening—or will happen—to our identities.

I also believe (and I suspect I am not alone) that our nation is at

330

risk for still other reasons, somewhat other than those the reports have defined. I perceive a danger in the faces upturned to the platforms where television evangelists hold sway, in the crowds demonstrating against abortion, in the rationales offered for bombing abortion clinics, in the affirmation of support for subway vigilanteeism, in the reminders that we must prepare for Armaggedon rather than resist the nuclear build-up, in the politics of image and theatre, in the burnt-out buildings in the cities, the homeless being locked out of railroad stations, the suicides on the farms.

The Need to Provoke

This is not, for an educator, a narrowly partisan position, I would insist, although I actually do not believe that an educator can ever be or needs to be neutral. It is not narrowly partisan because teaching is an undertaking oriented to empowering people to become different, to think critically and creatively, to pursue meanings, to make increasing sense of their actually lived worlds. It is oriented to provoking persons to care, to attend to their situations with solicitude, to be mindful, to be concerned, to be fully present and alive.

Education, perhaps I should say democratic education, involves provoking persons to get up from their seats—not to come to Christ or to be magically cured—but to say something, to speak in their own voices—against their own biographies and in terms of what they cherish in their shared lives, what they authentically hold dear. It involves getting them to leave their assigned places in the crowds or even in the marches to assemble in their plurality, in their diversity, to create an in-between among themselves, a space where they can appear as authentic individuals, each with a distinctive perspective on what they hold in common—a space where something new can find expression—and be explored and elaborated on and grow. It is when people become challengers, when they take initiatives, that they begin to create the kinds of spaces where dialogue can take place and freedom can appear. And it is then, probably only then, that people begin thinking about working together to bring into being a better, fairer, more humane state of things.

When I ponder that, when I see it in my mind's eyes, strangely enough I also think of excellence, although not in the way the word is commonly used. I think of a space of excellence—of individuals moving out into the open, appearing before other free persons, summoning them to move forward, not alone but in the name of full human connection, prompted to reveal—in that space—who they are and who they are trying to be.

I find an analogy somehow, which some of you may think odd, in the group of popular music stars who recorded the song "We Are the World" to raise money to relieve hunger in Africa. It was Harry

Belafonte who suggested it, although he gives credit to the late Harry Chapin, who was so concerned for world hunger and about people overcoming their own impassivity and indifference to suffering wherever it might exist. The singers came together to support a common cause; they appeared before each other, as it were, and they reached in some profound way a level of excellence they might never have attained alone – perhaps a moral excellence, but a musical excellence as well. It demanded a sense of agency on the part of Belafonte – and an ability to project, to imagine; and his initiation moved the others to embark on new beginnings for themselves.

The Full Human Connection

What has all this to do with reflective practice or with teacher education? You see, I believe that spaces ought to be opened wherever there are schools and teachers' colleges; and I believe there ought to be more openings to the surrounding world. It is hard for me to conceive of a reflective practitioner who lacks a sense of agency; and I am concerned about the erosion of the sense of agency today. It is not only due to a reliance upon a "thinking which looks on from above, and thinks of the object-in-general," or what Schon calls the model of technical rationality. Nor is it solely due to demands that teachers respond to prescriptions delivered from without, comply with extrinsic demands, pass a panoply of tests. It is due as well to the cost-benefit language that fills the air and thrusts so many of us into helpless silence. It is due to a spreading impassivity, a distancing, a terrible privatism. Benjamin De Mott, referring actually to the characters in recent novels, used a phrase that resonates for me. He spoke of what he called "the death of fellow-feeling"; and he called for the presentation of new images of human possibility. He said there is an undernourished understanding that we "have to feel forward – live forward a little, risk more in the name of full human connection. . . ."

And I think of Christopher Lasch now writing about the "minimal self," about consumerism, narcissism, and, yes, about "instrumental reason" and the preoccupation with technique. "It is the deterioration of public life," he writes, "together with the privatization and trivialization of moral ideas, that prevents a collaborative assault on the environmental and military difficulties confronting modern nations. But the party of Narcissus does not understand the source of these difficulties: the confusion of practice with technique." Is it not the responsibility of teacher educators to nourish the understanding De Mott described – of the importance of risking more "in the name of full human connection"? Is it not our responsibility to help "the party of Narcissus" see a bit more clearly than it presently sees?

I believe that considerations like these ought to inform the teacher

education enterprise, if indeed, we are committed to reflective practice or intend to commit ourselves in that way. It is almost as if people, because they feel helpless and powerless and mystified, perceive no alternative to the party of Narcissus. We know that when consciousness splits off from politics, the ideal of the self is presented as something that can be realized only in private life. And yet we realize full well that the self can never be actualized through solely private experiences, no matter how extraordinary those experiences might be, and surely not the ideal of the teacher's self. Connectedness is required, an overcoming of impassivity, a capacity to notice what lies around, and a commitment to the constitution of some kind of community.

The reports we have been reading do not touch on matters like these—or on living forward, risking more "in the name of full human connection." Nor do they suggest the passion required for any of this to occur. "The power of the passions," Robert Solomon has written, "is the power of possibilities." That means a grasp beyond the actual, the given; and it is this that lies at the core of a human being's involvement with the world. Without such a grasp, a reaching towards what is not yet, a desire to be different, we would be submerged forever in everydayness, or what is called the "given." We would have no inclination to teach or to learn. Or to be concerned. Every concern, after all, is a web of possibilities; every passion is an investment in what might or might not be. What troubles me is the lack of concern I feel around me—related, as I have suggested, to the breaking of promises and the erosion of the sense of agency. What troubles me as much is the absence of an active interest in freedom, a taking it for granted; and this cannot but signify a loss of interest in, or belief in, possibility. When I speak of possibility, I hope you realize, and of passion, I speak of what is grasped and sought through the taking of personal initiative, a personal and reflective move—in the midst of and in relation to others—towards what is not yet.

Lessons from Abroad

One reason for my pondering this so much may be that I have been reading a number of Czech novels; and novels make one notice, make one see oftentimes, what one might not otherwise have seen. This may be particularly true of literature written by those deprived of their human rights. It is disturbing, provocative, and recognizable very often; it is likely to move many readers into questions about passivity, acquiescence, and—especially—about freedom and what it means. In Milan Kundera's *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, the questions are aroused through a consideration of *kitsch*—totalitarian *kitsch*, democratic *kitsch*. Wherever it exists, says Kundera,

it finds expression in large abstractions, abstractions that weigh down heavily, no matter who the individual may be. It has to do often with what he calls the "dictatorship of the heart" to which "the mind finds it indecent to object," with feelings people in the mass all too easily share – about brass bands marching down the street, darling children running in the grass, betrayed motherlands, old-time pieties, simple truths (like Mom and apple pie) that can be counted upon to move almost anybody to tears. Totalitarian *kitsch* precludes all questioning; democratic *kitsch* often lulls people into not asking questions at all.

Kundera writes that the true function of *kitsch* is to serve as a folding screen set up to curtain off death. It functions as a means of denial, a way of putting a smiling face on everything, of convincing oneself that there is no need for reflection, that all is well. Kundera talks about the need to refuse the idea that all answers are given in advance. "A question is like a knife that slices through the stage backdrop and gives us a look at what lies behind it." I am suggesting that the one who gives up questioning, who respects the folding screens, is in danger of a type of corruption, of being sucked into the collectivity, of giving up all sense of authorship, of agency. I believe that folding screens should be, certainly for teacher educators, a matter of profound concern.

Many of the novels coming from abroad challenge half-educated simplifications; and there is a recurrent reminder that the only thing antagonistic to human beings is the absence of perceived antagonisms or contradictions. If freedom is, in part, a capacity to look at things as if they could be otherwise, it may be endangered less by external constraints than by acquiescence to the given, a submission to what is. "I am what I am," says the unfree person. "What do you expect?" Or, when that person is urged to take a new look or to learn something new, he or she is likely to say, "I know, I know." There is no consciousness of obstruction when a person has no desire to change or to question, if there is nothing in particular he or she wants to say. Under dictatorships, the ones who have an awareness of freedom are those who have something to say, who *want* to speak and write, and who experience the dictatorship as a concrete barrier to their very being. They take the obstruction personally; and, in order to be in the world and among others, they feel compelled to try to break through or to transcend.

That is why the most potent affirmations with respect to freedom and human rights are to be found in the writing coming out of Poland and Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Too many of our novels, in constrast, deal with loss, sex, drugs, dislocation, violence, she-devils, witches, therapy, crime, second marriages, money; and, with the exception of certain novels by minority writers (especially black

women), they seldom deal with freedom or with human rights.

I know. Many will insist we are free and that there is little reason to worry about it. But that is part of my point. Such a viewpoint, widely shared as it is, stands in the way of growth, change, and reflective practice as well. Also, it drains life of passion; it cancels out the power of possibilities. Of course we are free to get punk haircuts and dye half of our hair pink, have babies out of wedlock, abandon the babies, sleep on park benches, smoke pot in subway cars. This might be called negative freedom, freedom from interference in many (if not all) areas of our lives. It is strange, is it not, that most current interferences have to do with childbirth and with death?

Negative freedoms are not to be underestimated, of course. I would, however, call attention to the fact that the instances of freedom I have mentioned hardly involve deliberate and considered choice. And I would remind you that negative freedom, when generalized or embodied in policy (as in the case of deregulation or *laissez faire* business practices or the slackening of environmental protection or the erosion of affirmative action policies), often result in personal injury or exclusion or inhumane neglect. The freedom I have in mind is not an interior state; nor is it an original or natural endowment. It is always a function of some sort of membership or participation; it has to be continually sought in the face of resistances; it can never be finally achieved.

Like Dewey, I would "seek for freedom in something which comes to be, in a certain kind of growth; in consequences rather than in antecedents." I hope you can see the implications for teaching and teacher education. I hope you can recall also Dewey's description of the imagination as the gateway through which meanings derived from prior experiences find their way into the present and make present experiences more conscious. Without imagination, without consciousness, he said, "there is only recurrence, complete uniformity; the resulting experience is routine and mechanical. . . ." And a conscious experience is always one that opens to the future, to what is uncertain, to what is not yet. Recurrence, uniformity, routines: all these fix the human being in place and undercut the likelihood of a search for freedom, as they do the sense of new beginnings and of ventures into the unknown. What is teaching, what is reflective action, lacking these?

"We are free," said Dewey, "not because of what we statically are, but in as far as we are becoming different from what we have been." It is a matter of transforming mere preferences into conscious and intelligent choices; it is a matter of those choices becoming more and more diversified and reflective so that the range of possible action can expand, and people reach further and further beyond themselves. Is that not what education should be for? Surely, it is to teach a range

of ways of knowing in a diversity of domains. It is to communicate a sense of oughtness, of craft, an understanding of what it signifies to do things well. But it is, also, to indicate how such norm-governed knowing can open doorways, disclose landscapes whose existence was often never suspected before.

Passion and Involvement

Paradigms can be found in the natural sciences, in history, in anthropology, even in literary criticism. I am given to finding mine in art experiences. I cannot but think of how poems open to me when I read them—not sloppily, not lazily, not cursorily—but read them well. I cannot but think of how the Caravaggio paintings disclosed themselves to me because I had come to know a little about moving into pictorial frames, experiencing the space opening outward, noticing color relationships—the dark coming, that startling tragic light on faces, arms, hands that could be my own. And, as in the case of other painters—Turner, Cezanne, Van Gogh, Hopper—I realized that there would be more to see each time I returned, that worlds reveal themselves in response to a kind of knowing how. And I believed that each time I went back, I would become different from the way I was before. How would the model of technical rationality account for what is involved in teaching someone, enabling someone, to have an experience like that?

Obviously, it has to be consciously nurtured and consciously sought; and I would say that it always involves an overcoming of obstacles, internal as well as external. They can be such obstacles as mere inertia or lack of opportunity or cognitive (or imaginative, or perceptual) deficit. They can be the barriers raised by bureaucracy, by advertising, by technical languages, by sexism, by fatalism—all the factors that make individuals feel that their condition is the effect of prior causes, that they are caught in a mechanist network, and that there is nothing they can do. Freedom can be pursued only by those who refuse to accept all this as part of the "given" or of some objectively existent "reality." In teaching situations, this means trying to empower people to think about, to interpret, to gain perspective on what seems to work on them from without, to formulate it as a task or problem. Of course, there are limits imposed by the actualities of lived situations. But there is always the possibility of viewing those situations in a multiplicity of ways, of choosing their meanings, of identifying feasible alternatives. And there is, again, the potential power of the passions, the projection into the future, the reach beyond.

It is this projection that enables the individual to create a life project for himself or herself. With their objective situations as starting

points, human beings do define themselves by their projects. They move beyond the given by doing so; they continue, as it were, to produce themselves by the work they do, by the *praxis* in which they engage. Their needs, their passions, and their thoughts all participate as they move outside themselves toward something new. "This is what we call existence," wrote Jean-Paul Sarte, "and by this we do not mean a stable substance which rests in itself, but rather a perpetual disequilibrium, a wrenching away from itself, with all its body."

The teaching I would like to see, the practice I would like to see in this time of *kitsch* and passive acquiescense, is the kind that makes such disequilibrium conceivable, that moves the young to take consciously critical and cognitive action with respect to their own lived worlds. Of course it requires passion; and yet, when we think about it, for all the expressed concern about apathy and indifference, passion is never mentioned with regard to education. This may be because of the management or the technical orientation, associated as it is with the dispassionate, the instrumental, the presumably objective and measurable. The consequence too often is a replacement of action by behavior. Behavior is what lends itself to statistical determination and prediction; and people accept this the more they become submerged, as so many do, in the routines of everyday. As the narrator puts it in Walker Percy's *The Moviegoer*, they find themselves "sunk in the everydayness" of their own lives. They are, as it were, up against a wall, against something immutable; they are unlikely, experiencing it that way, to invest in what might or might not be. Or, as the same Percy narrator comments, they are unlikely to be "on to something" or to undertake any sort of search, even though "not to be on to something is to be in despair."

He, too, is talking about a project, about action rather than behavior. It seems clear that the freedom I have been talking about must be associated with the power to act, an *achieved* power to act. And acting involves embarking on new beginnings, taking initiative, moving forward towards the unpredictable. That is why I link learning—or learning to learn—with cognitive action rather than with sequences of behavior. It is why I believe that teachers, in addition to empowering students to see through multiple perspectives, need to stimulate imaginative thinking, the kind that summons up alternative realities and possibilities. I cannot but remember, when I say that, Alice Walker's *The Color Purple* and Celie's journey from objectness and acquiescence to articulation, to naming, to conversation—to vital existence in the world. You will recall that her becoming different would have been impossible without Shug Avery moving her to wrench away, to strain towards the possible, to experience a passion for the world. Celie is brought to see that, in her case, the given is embodied in "man"; and Shug tells her, "Man cor-

rupt everything. . . He on your box of grits, in your head, and all over the radio. He try to make you think he everywhere. Soon as you think he everywhere, you think he God. But he ain't. Whenever you trying to pray, and man plop himself on the other end of it, tell him to git lost. . . . Conjure up flowers, wind, water, a big rock. But this hard work, let me tell you. He been there so long, he don't want to budge. He threaten lightening, floods, and earthquakes. Us fight. I hardly pray at all. Everytime I conjure up a rock, I throw it." I suppose I am saying that a reflective teacher today ought to be something like a Shug Avery, moving people to resist what seems immovable and all-encompassing, to name what seems that way as problem or task. Of course it is hard work. We need more than instrumental rationality to help us if we want our students to conjure up, to imagine the equivalent of flowers, wind, water, and a big rock.

The ability to reach beyond, to envision a wider span of understanding and a better order of things, enables persons to perceive the deficiencies in what exists, to become capable of indignation or even outrage. Outrage is something other than a recognition of *kitsch*, than lamenting the folding screens of denial. In outrage (at man corrupting everything, at homelessness, at burnt-out buildings, at child abuse, at arms build-ups, at injustices) there may be efforts to reach out with others to do something, to repair. To feel that way is to recognize the importance of knowing and reflection as empowerments, as modes of release.

Umberto Eco's *The Name of the Rose* inflamed me about this all over again. Most of you know that the novel is about much more than the murder of monks in a monastery, more than semiotics, or the deciphering of signs and symbols and cryptograms. It is about the evils of secret knowledge, knowledge as possession (another source of folding screens). You may remember the monk talking about the evils of Aristotle's thought: "If this book were to become . . . had become an object for open interpretation, we would have crossed the last boundary." Not only is "open interpretation" a threat; so is any attempt to break through, to cross beyond the limits set by the possessors, the makers of the screens. The library is destroyed at last because it is impenetrable; and that makes me think not only of esoteric secret knowledge but of technical knowledge, of everything that exists in sterile spaces, apart from the "sensible and opened world" with which I began.

Reflection-in-Action

And it is with the sensible and opened world of practice with which I choose to end. David Schon, developing his notion of reflective practice—or "reflection-in-action"—describes a public school built

around a theory of knowledge all too familiar to those of us brought up with the model of technical rationality. "There is a concept of privileged knowledge," he writes, "which it is the business of teachers to teach and students to learn. This concept of knowledge is embodied in texts, curricula, lesson plans, examinations; indeed, it is institutionalized in every aspect of the school. Teachers are seen as technical experts who impart privileged knowledge to students. . . ."

The point I have been trying to make is that, if it is indeed the case that in a period like this we are committed or ought to be committed to provoking students to think and speak for themselves, this view of teaching in no sense relates to the kind of practice we ought to be considering. For one thing, it is extraordinarily difficult at this moment to justify any knowledge as "privileged," now that we know as much as we do about the diverse approaches even within the various specialities, and now that so many are recognizing the importance of perspectival and interpretive knowing. Moreover, many professionals are coming to realize that their practice is almost always situation-specific. To depend upon generalized formulae and quantitative measures in our field, to limit our concern to student success and failure in the assimilation of curriculum materials, the mastery of basic skills, is, as we well know, to distance or to set aside the particularities of classroom life. It is to act as if the classroom were an "object-in-general," not an unstable, changing, unpredictable human situation identical to no other in the world.

I am not thinking only in John Goodlad's terms about schools as distinctive social-psychological organizations (for all the regularities he describes across the classrooms studied in *A Place Called School*, for all the sameness and monotony). I am trying to hold a lens close to the actualities of practice, as Schon does, imagining often perplexed and uncertain teachers in daily encounters with young people whose lives and thinking processes they should know little about and *can* know little about because of the paucity of conversation or dialogue in classrooms and other work spaces. There are so few moments for conversation and dialogue; there is such difficulty in recapturing a natural and ordinary language in which authentic talk can take place. What opportunities do teachers actually have to find out what students take for granted where the given is concerned, where the pictures on the "box of grits" is concerned? How can they discover what is in the students' heads, "all over the radio" or on the TV for them? How many teachers can determine what students intuitively understand, what contradicts what they feel they know, what causes them to make mistakes and become confused? And, without such opportunities, how can they move individual learners to know the power of possibility, to reach beyond themselves?

This is a part of the appeal to me of Schon's notion of "reflection-in-action" (and, again, I would remind you that "action" implies the taking of initiatives). To reflect in the course of situated teaching is consciously to attend to what is happening and to those who, like the teacher, are present to that shared moment of life. Such reflection, for me, is not unlike what is involved in bringing a work of art alive in one's experience. Tacit knowing plays a part; intuitive awareness and imagination feed into the grasping of the painting, the poem, the dance. The emotions, too, are engaged; feeling works with cognition in the apprehending of the Cezanne landscape, the Eliot poem, the Balanchine ballet, *and* in the situation of practice where so many elements and nuances must be discerned.

My interest is in empowering individuals to think, to be mindful, to make sense, and to reach beyond. I am not suggesting that we set aside subject matter or the disciplines, which obviously provide perspectives, more and more ways of ordering experience, of symbolizing and articulating it. Nor am I arguing against the kind of professional education that introduces teachers-to-be to the human sciences, the arts and humanities, history, and the modes of technical literacy as they inform and ought to inform situations of practice. They offer resources for sense-making when it comes to such situations. They enable teachers to have resources at hand at particular moments when they have to single out what needs attention, when they want to identify alternatives or frame hypotheses or find precedents. They offer, or should offer, a consciousness of oughtness, of how situations ought to be interpreted and structured in accord with the standards governing the various forms of knowledge, or in accord with the moral norms that presumably are shared. This is quite, quite other than the simple application of technical or scientific constructs to fluid situations where they frequently do not apply; it is quite other than the application of conclusions from research external to the actual concerns, the uneasy questions of teachers immediately involved. I am not sure if one of the unwanted consequences of technical rationality and a skills orientation has been the desire for the folding screen, the submission to *kitsch*, the hidden fear. But if we are the kinds of educators who want to provoke, to move persons to move and become challengers, I believe we have to reconceive. And to stir ourselves, to disturb, to transform. An emotion, a passion can be a transformation of the world. It can break through the fixities; it can open to the power of possibility. It may even render practice more reflective. We need to open spaces for this in teacher education at this time in history, to renew as we reform.

40

The Master of Arts in Teaching: An Idea Whose Time Has Come, Again

By Theodore Kauss

Schools today ain't as good as they used to be—
and I guess they never was.
—Will Rogers

Although negative attacks on teacher training programs and positive attempts to improve the system of teacher preparation in the United States have been with us for centuries, the decade of the Eighties may be recognized as the period when foes and friends of teacher education programs finally joined forces for a common goal—to provide educational excellence in our schools through the professional efforts of outstanding instructors. Why now? Well, of the many reasons and factors, two seem to stand out: the release in April, 1983, of the report *Our Nation at Risk*, compiled by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, and the decision by the President of the United States to make education a major issue for his re-election campaign. *Our Nation at Risk* seemed to leap out of the plethora of education-related reports to capture the attention of leaders in government, business, education, and—more important—the interest of the general public.

The report addressed the problems and opportunities facing American education and offered recommendations for improvement in the areas of curriculum, content, standards and expectations, time for

---

THEODORE R. KAUSS *has been Vice President and Executive Director of The Frost Foundation, a Denver-based philanthropic organization, since 1977. Before joining the foundation, he held several administrative posts at Centenary College of Louisiana during the period 1972–77, including Executive Vice President, Dean of the College, and Acting President. He had earlier served as a senior associate with the management consulting firm of Cresap, McCormick and Paget and as director of the M.A.T. program and professor of education administration at Northwestern University. Dr. Kauss has also been a teacher and administrator in the public schools of his native state, Wisconsin.*

the "New Basics," and improvement of teaching, leadership, and fiscal support. The following statement from the report was intended to activate our senses for survival:

> The educational foundations of society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people. What was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur—others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments.
>
> If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves.

President Ronald Reagan has given a top priority rating to improving K-12 instruction and to providing special incentives to highly qualified and especially effective teachers. As a result of the impact of the *Risk* report (dubbed "Sputnik '83") and the influence of President Reagan, college and university professors and administrators, K-12 teachers and officials, and advocates and adversaries of American teacher education are generating a great deal of heat and a glimmer of light regarding the best format for preparing the teachers and scholars critically needed for our nation's classrooms. Even though their concerted efforts to find innovative solutions are commendable. I believe that they are looking in the wrong direction. The formula they seek is not something that must be created in the future. Instead, it is something of quality from our past—the Master of Arts in Teaching program or the M.A.T. This program has its roots in the teacher education units of Harvard and Northwestern universities as far back as the mid-1930s, but it was almost a generation later that it emerged as, arguably, the best teacher training format ever designed and implemented. Although there is not a "universal" M.A.T. plan, the basic components are essentially the same from program to program. The M.A.T. program recruits outstanding liberal arts graduates who have completed little or no undergraduate course work in education and places them in a graduate program which requires the successful completion of advanced study in the academic discipline to be taught, professional education classes, and a clinical-internship teaching experience. Generally, M.A.T. programs have attempted to select prospective teachers who possessed the sensitivity and compassion to be concerned with the personal and emotional growth of students and with their academic and intellectual progress.

The Origins of the M.A.T.

The M.A.T. concept was conceived at Harvard University in 1935

and the program, which they identified as the A.M.T., was initiated there in 1936. The program received the active support of Harvard's President, James Conant. Conant recognized the need to prepare secondary school teachers who were versed in the views of the academicians and the professional educators. The acceptance of the Harvard program was an important breakthrough because the entire community of scholars became involved in the preservice education of teachers. In a sense, this interdisciplinary involvement bridged a gap between liberal arts professors and professional educators.

Harvard's progam served as a model in teacher training for many institutions. However, because teachers were in oversupply and there was little incentive for liberal arts graduates to make additional investments of time and money to prepare for the low-salaried teaching positions which were then available (this has a familiar ring to it), this prototype project met with only moderate success during the 1930s and 1940s and was eventually deactivated.

These conditions closely paralleled those encountered by the graduate internship program offered by Northwestern University in 1935. In 1933, the faculty and administration of Northwestern's School of Education were concerned about the pressing need for more and better-prepared teachers for elementary and secondary schools. In 1935, through cooperative action by the faculty and administration of the School of Education and the Graduate School the Graduate-Internship program for the preparation of teachers was developed.

The basic purpose of the program was to offer graduates of colleges or universities who demonstrated high academic ability an opportunity, through a fifth year of study (actually five quarters), to prepare themselves for a teaching career. The program was designed to enable qualified applicants 1) to pursue graduate study in academic subjects, 2) to engage in practice teaching under professional supervision, 3) to develop professional competencies through teaching internships, 4) to fulfill the requirements for the Master of Arts in Education or Master of Arts in Teaching degree, and 5) to complete the requirements for state teaching certification.

The Graduate-Internship program at Northwestern was inaugurated in the 1935 summer session. The first and second summer sessions required full-time study in academic and professional areas related to selecting a teaching position. The intervening academic year required a combined program of classroom teaching under supervision and part-time graduate study. An internship in teaching at a cooperating school in the Chicago metropolitan area constituted what was then a unique feature of this academic and professional program. The Northwestern program operated successfully for a decade, but

World War II created conditions which caused its termination at the end of the 1945 summer session—ironically, just before the end of the war.

Although Harvard and Northwestern discontinued their A.M.T. and Graduate-Internship programs, the underlying purposes for originating the programs still existed and numerous educators were convinced that conventional teacher training programs, heavily weighted with courses on professional education, were not attractive to many bright college students.

Our distinguished moderator, Frank Keppel, while serving as dean of Harvard's Graduate School of Education, wrote in the December, 1952, issue of the *Journal of Teacher Education* that M.A.T. programs are based on the conviction that good teaching requires four basic elements: 1) a sound liberal education, 2) a thorough mastery of the academic field in which the candidate expects to teach, 3) an understanding of the role of schools in society, and 4) a mastery of the teaching process. Other educators in agreement with Frank believed that these four requisites could not be met consistently without a redefinition of the structure of conventional teacher education programs. Traditionally, teacher education had been perceived as having two distinct elements; the academic, and the professional or technical. Rather than seek a compromise between the two traditions, it seemed imperative to these educators to arrive at a synthesis of the academic and professional elements. The M.A.T. format provided a vehicle for the achievement of this merger.

Similarly, some major private foundations recognized that the attraction and retention of gifted teachers was one of the basic problems facing education. In particular, the Ford Foundation Fund for the Advancement of Education considered it essential to revitalize the education of prospective teachers. Thus, representatives of the Fund urged the recruitment of outstanding liberal arts students for the teaching profession and offered funding for scholarships and related program support.

In keeping with these convictions, in 1951 the Fund presented to Harvard University a grant to support the rejuvenation of its M.A.T.-type program, which was again identified as the A.M.T. program. In the same year, the Fund also made a substantial contribution to the University of Arkansas to establish a fifth-year program of teaching internship and professional study. Other programs which received Ford Foundation financial support at that time included those at Cornell University, Temple University, and the University of Louisville.

A Carnegie Corporation grant helped initiate an M.A.T. program at Yale University in 1951. Wesleyan University (Connecticut) re-

ceived Carnegie support for its program a year later. During the next decade, M.A.T. programs at other schools, including Northwestern University, were implemented with financial assistance from private foundations.

The M.A.T. was extremely successful in the 1960s. By 1968 more than 100 programs were in operation. However, for reasons to be discussed later in this paper, the M.A.T.'s popularity waned between 1972 and 1980, when many of the programs were terminated, with such prominent dropouts as Duke, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Northwestern, Reed, Wesleyan, and Yale. Although the M.A.T. program was eventually phased out by these outstanding institutions, the M.A.T. format was generally praised by their faculties.

The M.A.T. Format

The Master of Arts in Teaching Program is designed to attract very bright liberal arts graduates by offering them a program combining professional training with a concentration of course work in an academic major. The program's underlying philosophy is based upon the ideal of the teacher-scholar who possesses effective and imaginative teaching techniques as well as the potential and desire for continuous intellectual growth. M.A.T. advocates believe that the realization of this ideal requires formal study beyond the baccalaureate. Standard teacher education curricula are considered inadequate because the four-year program tends to minimize the importance of the academic major while it emphasizes pedagogy. Conversely, liberal arts students may possess a depth of knowledge in a particular discipline, but have insufficient background in professional education. The M.A.T. format provides the liberal arts graduate with the opportunity to become successful as a teacher and as a scholar. Although the M.A.T. was initially restricted to aspiring secondary-level teachers, some programs were developed for elementary teachers. Some of these programs received grant support from special U.S. Government programs.

The Master of Arts in Teaching program has been recognized by leading authorities in the field of education as one of the significant innovations in teacher education during the past fifty years. Although they probably did not use such glowing terms, many of those involved in the various aspects of the program have voiced their support for and satisfaction with the program.

While the Ford Foundation has recently commissioned a survey of M.A.T. graduates, the limited research previously conducted on the program, to my knowledge, was completed prior to 1970. These findings indicated that some M.A.T.s moved from the classroom to administrative posts and others chose graduate programs that took

them to college teaching or other fields such as law, medicine, and business. Of course, some remained in elementary and secondary school teaching. Nevertheless, many of these bright and talented individuals, with their missionary zeal to be educators, did serve for five years or so as instructors in our nation's classrooms and influenced thousands of students who benefited from their knowledge, enthusiasm, and ability.

The studies completed between the late '50s and the late '60s concerning the M.A.T. model also measured the success of the program based on the opinions and judgments of the people most directly involved: the M.A.T. graduates and the administrators who employed them.

Ernest Stabler of Wesleyan reported in the July, 1960, issue of *The Educational Record* that Wesleyan conducted a survey involving their M.A.T. graduates with two years of teaching experience. Results showed that 87 percent of those questioned were satisfied with the teaching load. The tone and atmosphere of the schools was rated good or very good by 93 percent. The overwhelming majority also agreed that pupil responsiveness was good. Most graduates believed that as teachers they had great freedom in the classrooms. None of the graduates questioned planned to leave the field of education, although 65 percent said that they wanted administrative jobs in a few years. The conclusions indicated that, on the whole, these teachers were satisfied with their jobs, their schools, and their status in the community.

Studies conducted at Yale, as reported by William P. Holden in the *Journal of Teacher Education* in December, 1959, also presented positive reports. While the Wesleyan study evaluated post-graduate responses, the Yale studies consisted of program evaluations by interns and appraisals of the interns by their principals. There was almost universal approval of the program among interns. They particularly liked the "balanced program" of subject and professional courses. Although a few considered the education courses to be of limited use, the majority found them valuable.

Principals responding to the questionnaire were favorably impressed by the M.A.T. interns. When asked to compare M.A.T.s with teachers of "similar" experience, principals rated the M.A.T. interns superior by a vote of more than two to one.

A study I completed in 1968 included an analysis of Northwestern's Master of Arts in Teaching program. Value judgments concerning the effectiveness of the M.A.T. at Northwestern University were received from 1962–1966 graduates of the program and department chairmen representing school districts which employed former M.A.T.s. The value judgments were analyzed to determine how well

the program met its objectives and how valuable it was perceived to be by former participants.

Data were gathered through the use of two questionnaires. One questionnaire was sent to former Northwestern University M.A.T.s who participated in the program during the 1961–65 school years. Addresses were available for 182 of the 266 former interns. One hundred twenty-three (or 68 percent) of these completed and returned their questionnaires. Responses were received concerning 1) personal data, 2) student teaching, 3) internship teaching, and 4) university course work.

The second questionnaire was sent to 118 public school department chairpersons who worked directly with graduates of Northwestern University's M.A.T. program. Eighty-five returned the questionnaire, or 72 percent of the total sample. This instrument elicited evaluations of former M.A.T.s in the following areas: 1) knowledge of subject matter, 2) ability to teach subject matter, and 3) skill in discipline and classroom management. The observers' prognoses regarding the former interns' success in the field of education and suggestions for modifications of Northwestern's M.A.T. program were also received.

Although the findings suggested that a majority of M.A.T. graduates were not satisfied with all the components of the program, many former M.A.T.s responded that the format offered them a practical and effective means of accomplishing educational and career objectives, including graduate course work in a selected discipline, certification for secondary school employment, and a full-time teaching position. Most department chairpersons in the employing schools praised the M.A.T. product and the program.

Both evaluating groups recommended that courses in methods and techniques be expanded to emphasize practical approaches and solutions to problems encountered by neophyte teachers. There was general agreement that the M.A.T. program should continue to attempt to improve the quality of teaching in school systems through the selection and preparation for teaching of recent college graduates with strong academic backgrounds.

Specific Solutions

On March 1 of this year [1985], The National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, an independent commission established a year ago by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, issued its report, *A Call for Change in Teacher Education*. This report has not achieved the acclaim of *Our Nation at Risk* and has not attracted the attention of the general public as have the President's pronouncements on education.

However, this recent study is more specific in its directives to those involved in and concerned with the academic programs and clinical experiences necessary for the professional preparation of America's teachers. As a result of this specificity, and the movement already underway to upgrade teacher training across the board, this recent report may provide the impetus needed to reinstate the M.A.T. as the exemplary design for our teacher education programs for the remainder of this century and perhaps beyond. Although the report does not recommend requiring a year of post-baccalaureate study for teacher certification, some of its recommendations and suggestions point to the need for this fifth year and to the importance of a strong liberal arts base for all teachers, especially those teaching in secondary schools. For instance, the importance of liberal education, subject specialization, professional education, and internship experiences were emphasized in the study, as represented by the following excerpts in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* of March 6, 1985:

> Recommendations:
> Programs for Teacher Education
>
> *Recommendation #4:* Each teacher education program should be an exacting, intellectually challenging integration of liberal studies, subject specialization from which school curricula are drawn, and content and skills of professional education.
>
> For the Programs for Teacher Education, the Commission's primary focus of study was the proper education of the teacher; program length and placement became issues when we identified what would be necessary for capable students to achieve such an education. We maintain that teachers should have a liberal education equivalent to that of the best-educated members of their community, not simply a few courses in each of several general academic fields; that teachers should know and understand the intellectual and practical content from which curricula are drawn, not simply become familiar with their portion of a school's curriculum; that teachers should have both the skills to teach and the knowledge of the research and experiential bases for those skills, not simply a set of prescriptions for what to do under various classroom circumstances.
>
> We agreed that a program to prepare teachers must be coherent and sequential. Its intellectual demands for its students should be commensurate with the requirements of excellent teaching, not with the level of ability of the least capable student who applies for admission. Likewise, only professors, supervisors, and

cooperating teachers who adhere to such standards for themselves and their students should be permitted to work in the program.

Adoption of Recommendation #4 will demand longer programs than most colleges and universities now require. (Some states already require an additional year after the baccalaureate that combines student teaching and pedagogical study.) We urge that, as states review their certification requirements and colleges and universities study their programs, they let the educational needs of teachers determine the length of teacher education programs. We particularly encourage those colleges and universities offering only a baccalaureate degree and those having graduate programs to explore mutually beneficial arrangements that will permit all highly qualified students desiring to become teachers to complete the best program possible.

Recommendation #5: Following their completion of a teacher education program and the awarding of a provisional certificate, new teachers should complete an induction period or internship of at least a year's duration for which compensation is provided.

We advise all states to develop for teacher candidates an internship or other induction experience beyond the provisional certification requirement. During this period, the school, the profession, and higher education should work together to help the new teacher become successfully immersed in the teaching profession. Because the provisionally certified teachers will render real teaching services, compensation is justified much as it is in other professions that require internships. Interns, however, should have reduced teaching loads so that they have time to participate in professional development activities, including seminars.

The essential elements of Recommendation #4 are integral parts of the M.A.T. design which demands, in almost all instances, a B.A. degree in liberal arts; a general understanding of the teacher's world through a blend of educational theory, practice, foundations, and research; clinical experiences under the tutelage of cooperating teachers, supervisors, and professors who themselves are excellent role models; and the need for a longer (fifth-year) period of preparation. Other key components of the M.A.T. format are evident in Recommendation #5. They are, provisional certification, paid internships, and reduced teaching loads (Northwestern's M.A.T.s carried a three-fifths teaching load) to facilitate participation in professional development, including seminars.

The obvious question is, "If the M.A.T. can be considered the ideal format for programs in pedagogy, why was it dropped by many of our premier institutions after several decades of successful opera-

tion?" There are several reasons. A number of universities accepted the challenge of innovation but rejected the duties of maintenance. That is, they were committed to offering an experimental program but were not interested in providing a program which, at least for them, had become routine. Other institutions felt that the loss of "soft money" (and prestige) when foundation and government grants to their programs were terminated made it no longer feasible to offer the program. Still others decided that their academic and budgetary priorities should be moved to areas other than teacher education. In addition, the critical teacher shortage in our country during the 1960s, when many M.A.T. programs were initiated and nurtured, became teacher surpluses in the 1970s. These surpluses, along with a need to reduce expenses, caused some school systems to return to less expensive hiring practices, which were directed at recruiting new teachers from the pool of graduates of undergraduate education programs.

Perhaps the major reason for the decline (and in some cases the demise) of the M.A.T. in the 1970s is that the population boom subsided and many school systems nationwide were forced to close buildings and dismiss professional staff, including tenured teachers. Obviously, hiring paid interns, even at the 60 percent rate of a beginning teacher, in the face of cutbacks and retrenchments was an indefensible approach for many administrators. Besides, just as Harvard discovered in the 1930s and 1940s, many college students who considered pursuing the M.A.T. were discouraged—and as a result turned to other professions—because few teaching jobs were available to them after graduation.

The M.A.T. Mandate

The potential pool of M.A.T.s is even deeper in talent today because of a greater interest on the part of mid-career professionals, male and female, in fields outside of education who want to become teachers. Harvard started a graduate program two years ago for aspiring teachers with strong backgrounds and successful experiences in the fields of math and science. This program attracts people in their forties, fifties, and sixties who have met certain family obligations, attained many of their career goals, and are financially in a position to do what they want to do—namely, teach. Although the new Harvard program is not officially the M.A.T. (or A.M.T.), it's close.

Primarily because of our need for quality in classroom teaching (quantity might also be a consideration in light of projections of teacher shortages within a couple of years), the M.A.T. program is obviously an idea whose time has come, again. Since we now have

the M.A.T. mandate, it is worth asking what basic steps must be taken to reinstate, establish, or enhance programs across the country.

Undoubtedly, any listing of procedures for change will seem to be oversimplified, because dropping undergraduate teacher education programs will cause waves (or even shock waves) on many of our campuses and in some school districts. After all, it could result in the elimination of some professorships. Also, students in teacher education programs would feel the effects of this change because they would have to spend an extra year and extra dollars for a five-year program (even if partial tuition scholarships and part-time paid internships were available). Moreover, school systems would undoubtedly have to upgrade salary schedules to accommodate all the starting teachers with M.A.T. training and clinical experience. Additionally, graduate schools will generally accept only those students with solid B and above averages for admission to the M.A.T. program.

There is one final hurdle to the widespread conversion to an M.A.T. format: the certification standards of the states. To this I can only say that if all the reports of prominent commissions, the results of public opinion polls, and the remarks of our President and other high-level officials are valued, each state will accept the charge to change certification standards to require the fifth-year M.A.T. degree as the entry level teaching requirement for our elementary and secondary classrooms. A similar type of nationwide action was accomplished through legislation some twenty years ago when the last of the two-year teacher training programs became extinct with the elimination of the county normal schools. Amazingly, there were many who protested this action, using the same basic arguments mentioned above. Due to a teacher shortage in some regions, this change was not as rapid as planned, but eventually it was completed. I hope that lawmakers in the next couple of years will resist using a possible teacher shortage in some subject areas and grade levels as an excuse to delay the implementation of the mandatory M.A.T. degree for all beginning teachers hired after the 1990–91 school year.

Unfortunately, the impetus for the elimination of undergraduate teacher training programs might have to come from the lawmakers instead of the educators. Actually, many states now require a master's degree of their K-12 teachers within a five-year period after entering the profession. However, as a positive thinker I wish to envision the following scenario for retooling teacher preparation programs.

First of all, those responsible for undergraduate teacher training will accept that M.A.T. programs for preparing entry level K-12 teachers are vital for the long-term good of all aspects of education in America. Then the appropriate committees of the education colleges, schools, or departments will meet with their liberal arts col-

leagues and public school administrators to form the kind of partnership needed to ensure the enduring success of the program. This will result in an agreement to phase out existing B.S. programs for teacher certification during the 1980s, and to replace them with the M.A.T. Then representatives of our colleges and universities will take their case to the major and mid-sized private foundations of America, including those that helped the M.A.T.s in the 1950s and 1960s. In a sense, this will be the original support system revisited—with a similar story but a greater sense of urgency. It's my educated guess that these potential funders will be receptive to requests for grants for M.A.T. scholarship and program support and would consider continuing this assistance into the next century. Through the dedicated efforts and generous contributions of these key players, our leading colleges and universities will be able to provide the quintessential teacher preparation program required to remove mediocrity from our elementary and secondary schools and replace it with excellence—the M.A.T.

Closing Remarks

By Francis Keppel

I've been asked to summarize, and indeed I've noticed that there are a number of people here now who were not here this morning. So let me just remind those who were here, and say to those who were not, that the first topic was "Some Myths of Teacher Education." What *are* the myths of teacher education. Which of the emperor's clothes aren't there?

The first myth was that young people can't be encouraged to enter teaching by their elementary and high school teachers, and indeed I would hope and assume that this *is* a myth.

The second myth was that we can solve the problem of teacher quality by some kind of formal testing at a single point—or at more than one point—in time.

Total reliance on a testing procedure is unwise by its very nature. It is also unwise because, given the present demographic circumstances, such a reliance will vastly reduce the probability of minority students entering teaching. And do you really want to remove role models who might themselves influence high school students to enter teaching, especially at a time when a rapidly increasing proportion of national high school students are from the minorities?

The next myth was that teacher education can reform itself. That's drawn rather harshly, but it's roughly what I hear. In fact, the historical record of the last ten years shows that the so-called reformation—and I don't know if it's a good one or not—is being carried out by governors and legislators. That's where the point of power has been for a decade.

A fourth kind of myth has been that you enter teacher education at a certain time in your life—in college or immediately after. That's a myth that has held sway in peoples' minds, but is not necessarily relevant in a highly mobile society, with people changing careers several times in a lifetime.

There's a fifth myth that low salaries are by themselves the cause of both difficulty in recruiting and difficulty in maintaining teachers

on the staff. I think the phase to underscore there is *by themselves.* Not that low salaries are not obviously a factor—they are. But salary level may not be the most important factor in recruitment or retention of teachers. Of greater importance, it appears, are the nature of the job, the company you keep, and your sense of being part of a larger cause.

The sixth myth was that all teachers have to be paid the same amount. That is demonstrably a myth, because for a great many decades the United States has allowed for de facto increases in teachers' salaries by having higher salaries paid in some school districts. To make progress on the salary scale, then, teachers didn't so much advance within their own schools as simply move to a school district with a higher salary level. That was true in the '30s, '40s, '50s, '60s, and '70s maybe, but now is no longer so true. I think the salary differentials are leveling off a bit as the states begin to get into the act. But that was not the point Mr. Maeroff made. His main point was that people feel it's written somewhere that all teachers have to be paid the same. And he said, in a polite way, "Nuts."

Let me add one myth of my own. I think it may be a myth that the most difficult problem in American education, at least at the primary and secondary school level, is the condition of the high schools in the big city slums.

What I'm getting at is the despair of a society that labels the slum high schools an unsolvable problem. In other words, the attitude that these schools are not part of the general concern of the public—they're just a hopeless mess. I believe it's a myth that this is an insoluble problem. I will add that one to Gene's list.

We then discussed purposes. And the following comments are drawn from the paper of Maxine Greene's, which I think most people here would agree was in the Deweyan philosophical tradition, a tradition not much referred to in this land today, a tradition suggesting room for both hope and passion, if you will, in the role of schools in our society. Clearly, one of the points she made, and one to which we all responded, was that one of the duties of our schools should be to take care of the children at risk. Indeed, many of today's speakers said that to you.

Continuing in the Deweyan tradition, she stated that the chief job of the public schools is to empower people to think differently, to care. In other words, it is the job of the schools to *provoke* students.

I think it's also fair to say that she wanted much more discussion of goals than there is now—and almost, by inference, somewhat less discussion of means. It was also noted that one of the goals of the schools should be to lead pupils to an active citizenry. That is cer-

tainly an idea of good and long standing, but apparently is not addressed in most of the discussions of teacher education today.

Dr. Greene also said that the schools should be *open*—open to the community and the society around them—much more than she felt they had been. Not that there were walls around the schools, but that there wasn't much traffic between them and the real world.

Most of you heard Ted Kauss's presentation on the Master of Arts in Teaching, so I won't go over that again in detail. In response to that, however, I would remind you that the question was raised that perhaps this idea, while certainly relevant for the present post-college entry into secondary school teaching, may be even more relevant as something that comes later in an individual's career, if you could ever get it financed.

Let me comment on that myself. We've conducted this discussion as if for the last fifteen or twenty years the liberal arts colleges have offered high quality and consistent programs in liberal or general education. Neither of those two statements in my judgement is true. Quality and intellectual discipline in the liberal arts eroded during the 1960s and 1970s. Therefore, if you depend on that system to produce someone who knows the subject—be it language, literature, or science—and who has a reasonably good general education, I think you've got to worry. Why? Because people are now coming out of these programs with a curious mixture of specialties, strung together like ill-matched beads. You can't be sure that someone teaching biology will know any chemistry. You can't be sure that someone teaching English and American literature will know anything about English history.

The problem is painfully simple: you cannot trust the results of the liberal arts colleges today.

All of the foregoing leads me to suggest that there are six choices presented to us.

The first choice is based on the comments growing out of Maxine Greene's paper. Back in the 1950s, which I suggested was a relevant time for comparison, teacher education relied to a considerable extent on the likelihood that psychology and the social sciences were going to increase in usefulness and stature and be able to be applied in the schools. In short, there was a very considerable optimism about the extent to which teacher education could rely on the social sciences.

As a result, reliance on the teachings of philosophy decreased in the period beginning after the Second War. I present to you the question today, "Which way would you go now?" And I would add, somewhat sardonically, that I see no evidence that the psychological sciences have increased the probability of the success of the applica-

tion of any one of their principles since 1950. That's pretty harsh talk, but I'm deliberately saying it to provoke this choice. We have a choice of which of the intellectual disciplines we will follow: philosophy and intellectual and social history—or psychology and sociology, at least to the extent that these latter two fields follow a scientific rather than a humanistic model. I think there's a choice. Where will we put our emphasis? We won't throw one out for the other, of course, but where will we put our emphasis?

The second choice: There is a tendency to think that in teacher education the need is to get prospective teachers into a teacher education program, teach them something about teaching, and then get them right into the schools. In fact, as we discussed, some people are brought in for a short term, a limited number are kept for a longer term, and some are brought in later. Do we want to have that variety and flexibility?

Third, there is clearly a debate about whether the teaching job should be built on a hierarchical model—with some teachers getting paid more and assuming more responsibility—or on a collegial model, which I will simplify as a "flat-level" model? There is clearly a debate in progress about this aspect of the teaching job.

Next, it is said that we have a choice between undergraduate or graduate education for teachers. My guess about that is that when you run short of people, you'd better do both.

Fifth, the question has been raised whether we want to use college or university teacher education as the place to offer training in the teaching of courses, the so-called clinical teacher training, or do we want to use the schools as a base? It sounds as if there is a choice.

And finally, to what extent do we want to make teacher education open to others—to scientists, artists, and others, as Maxine Greene has suggested? That's not being done much today.

These are the choices I see stemming from this discussion. As a benediction, I can only say that I hope those who continue this discussion will *try to get the numbers right*. How many teachers do we need? How many from where? And how much does this need relate to the actual sources of supply?

In conclusion, I would add that almost all of us would say that the thing to do is to make American education look like College of the Atlantic.

Thank you.

About College of the Atlantic

The 1985 Bar Harbor Colloquium on Teacher Education was held at College of the Atlantic, a small, innovative college located on the shore of Maine's Mount Desert Island. Founded in 1969, the College has developed a unique liberal arts curriculum built around the study of human ecology. A fully accredited four-year institution, College of the Atlantic awards the Bachelor of Arts degree in Human Ecology.